

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ALBANY DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| MARY E. RICHARDSON, | : | |
| | : | |
| Plaintiff, | : | |
| | : | |
| V. | : | |
| | : | Case No.: 1:14-CV-77 (WLS) |
| DAVID MOSLEY and DOUGHERTY | : | |
| COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, | : | |
| | : | |
| Defendants. | : | |
| | : | |

ORDER

On June 18, 2014, Plaintiff filed a “Response” to the Court’s Order denying her Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. (Doc. 5.) The Court construes this Response as a motion to reconsider the Court’s IFP denial. For the following reasons, Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 5) is **DENIED**.

As noted by the Eleventh Circuit in *Region 8 Forest Serv. Timber Purchasers Council v. Alcock*, 993 F.2d 800, 805-06 (11th Cir. 1993), relief granted from motions for reconsideration is within “the sound discretion of the district judge.” The Court’s Local Rules also address motions for reconsideration, and provide, in relevant part:

7.6 MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION. Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice. Whenever a party or attorney for a party believes it is absolutely necessary to file a motion to reconsider an order or judgment, the motion shall be filed with the Clerk of court within fourteen (14) days after entry of the order or judgment.

M.D. Ga. L. R. 7.6. It is the longstanding practice of this Court to grant a motion for reconsideration only when the movant timely demonstrates that either: (1) there has been an intervening change in the law; (2) new and previously unavailable evidence has been discovered through the exercise of due diligence; or (3) the court made a clear error of law. *McCoy v. Macon Water Auth.*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

With these standards in mind, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate the existence of any of the three factors listed above. In her motion, Plaintiff merely states that she has been waiting to get her money and prays that the Court accepts her report. Plaintiff's motion is, however, devoid of any information that would cause the Court to reconsider its decision to deny Plaintiff's IFP motion. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 5) is **DENIED** and the Court's Order denying Plaintiff's IFP Motion (Doc. 4) still stands. Therefore, Plaintiff shall pay the filing fee within **twenty-one (21) days of entry of this Order** or her claim will be dismissed without further notice or proceedings.

SO ORDERED, 19th day of June 2014.

/s/ W. Louis Sands
W. LOUIS SANDS, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT